## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/718,867      | SONG ET AL.  |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |
| BEN C. WANG     | 2192         |  |

| ontinuation Sheet (FTOL-303)   |
|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |
| THE REPLY FILED 27 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  |
| 1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following  |
| time periods:  |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.   |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).   |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of  |
| filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or   |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).   |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  |
| <ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>   |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-46 - Examiner maintains the 35 USC 103(a) rejections.   |
| Claim(s) rejected. 1-40 - Examiner maintains the 55 555 755(d) rejections.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).   |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).   |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>Applicant argued that neither Blaser nor Softricity describes "a privatized virtual registry created from an operation system registry system wherein the application software only accesses the privatized virtual registry" (cited on page 17, first non-full paragraph and second and third full paragraphs in the REMARKS)</u>   |
| Examiner's Response: Examiner disagrees. Softricity teaches that SystemGurad® creates a virtual Registry for each application.  Registry settings created cannot be seen by other applications (e.g., Fig. of 'SoftGrid® Environment'; Sec. of 'SystemGuard®   |
| Capabilities', Sub-Sec. of 'Virtual Registry') (emphasis added)  Further, Applicant argued that Blaser does not describe "a privatized virtual file resource created from an operating system file   |
| system wherein the application software only accesses the privatized virtual file resource" (cited on page 17, first non-full paragraph in the REMARKS)  |
| Examiner's Response: Examiner disagrees. Softricity discloses that SystemGurad® also handles requests made by applications   |
| to files in specific directories by redirecting the requests. For example, if an application looks for a file located in a specific directory on the local C drive, SystemGurad® can redirect any requests to that directory inside of its virtual file system (e.g., Fig. of 'SoftGrid® Environment'; Sec. of 'SystemGuard® Capabilities', Sub-Sec. of 'Virtual File System') (emphasis added)  |
| The prior art rejection is maintained by Examiner.  12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   |
| 13. Other:   |

/Ben C Wang/ Examiner, Art Unit 2192

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20090302